

Appl. No. 10/531,191  
Amdt. dated September 10, 2008  
Response to Office Action of July 11, 2008

### Remarks

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for alleged lack of enablement. The Examiner stated that the specification enables certain specific compounds (i.e., phosphoric acid, phosphorous pentoxide, ammonium dihydrogenphosphate and diammonium hydrogenphosphate), but does not more broadly enable “a compound which releases phosphate ions in a solution,” as was recited in the claims.

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended herein. Further, claims 3 and 6 are canceled. Therefore, claims 1-2, 4-5 and 7 are presently pending.


The amendments to claims 1 and 2 limit the “compound which releases phosphate ions in a solution” to “a compound selected from the group consisting of phosphoric acid ( $\text{H}_3\text{PO}_4$ ), phosphorous pentoxide ( $\text{P}_2\text{O}_5$ ), ammonium dihydrogenphosphate ( $\text{NH}_4\text{H}_2\text{PO}_4$ ), and diammonium hydrogenphosphate [ $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{HPO}_4$ ].” This amendment finds explicit support in the specification at, e.g., page 5, lines 11-14, and is respectfully believed to be fully responsive to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Appl. No. 10/531,191  
Amdt. dated September 10, 2008  
Response to Office Action of July 11, 2008

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the claims are in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter H. Priest  
Reg. No. 30,210  
Priest & Goldstein, PLLC  
5015 Southpark Drive, Suite 230  
Durham, NC 27713-7736  
(919) 806-1600